



Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 1009683-000497

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Syuji Maruta et al.)	
Application No.: 10/763,281)	Group Art Unit: 2167
Filed: January 26, 2004)	Examiner: CHERYL RENE LEWIS
For: IMAGE PROCESSING)	Confirmation No.: 6487
APPARATUS FACILITATING)	
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT)	

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following remarks are in response to the Notice of Allowance mailed November 18, 2008.

Applicants first wish to thank Examiner Lewis for the allowance of claims 1-23. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance for the following reason.

Item 3 in the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance, at the second paragraph appears to distinguish only independent claim 1 over the prior art of record. However, because the Examiner's statement in this paragraph explicitly applies to claims 4 and 11, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner place a statement on the record indicating that the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in this paragraph should not be interpreted as narrowing the scope of independent claims 4 and 11 to include any limitations of claim 1 that are explicitly recited in claims 4 and 11.

Item 3 in the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance, at the third paragraph, appears to distinguish only independent claim 13 over the prior art of record. However, because the Examiner's statement in this paragraph explicitly applies to claims 14, 15 and 23, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner place a

statement on the record indicating that the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in this paragraph should not be interpreted as narrowing the scope of independent claims 14, 15 and 23 to include any limitations of claim 13 that are explicitly recited in claims 14, 15 and 23.

Item 3 in the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance, at the fourth paragraph, appears to distinguish only independent claim 16 over the prior art of record. However, because the Examiner's statement in this paragraph explicitly applies to claims 20, 21 and 22, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in this paragraph should not be interpreted as narrowing the scope of independent claims 20, 21 and 22 to include any limitations of claim 16 that are explicitly recited in claims 20, 21 and 22.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: February 17, 2009

By: 

Michael Britton
Registration No. 47,260

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620